

11-1954

Churches of Christ Salute You with a Herald of Truth: November Report and December Sermons

Herald of Truth

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/hot_docs


Recommended Citation

Herald of Truth, "Churches of Christ Salute You with a Herald of Truth: November Report and December Sermons" (1954). *Herald of Truth Documents*. Paper 72.

http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/hot_docs/72

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Herald of Truth Records at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Herald of Truth Documents by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU. For more information, please contact dc@acu.edu.

Churches of Christ

salute  you



NOVEMBER REPORT
AND DECEMBER SERMONS — 1954

HERALD OF TRUTH

CHURCH OF CHRIST

1144 South Emporia

Wichita 11, Kansas

December 10, 1954

Mr. John F. Reese
c-o Herald of Truth
Abilene, Texas

Dear Brother Reese:

Thanks so much for your prompt attention to the sending of the TV film for our use here in Wichita in interesting the TV station in it.

We contacted the stations here and find that they are indeed very much interested in the film. They told us that they believed that time could be obtained in the very near future namely, January, or February 1. They also stated that there would be no charge for the time. This of course made us very happy. Looks as though our time was well spent in securing the film. The film has been sent back to Chicago, and we want to thank you very much for the same.

Last week KWBB radio station here in Wichita called me and said he had some good news. He told me that all of the radio stations here in Wichita had just completed a "survey" of all programs and had found that the Herald of Truth rated 2nd place, even over CBS stations. This covered 8 counties in this area. He said that KWBB consider it "tops" and even in their opinion it rated 1st place. He said that out of every 100 homes, 16 listen to the Herald of Truth. This made us very happy and we secured a nice long news release about it in the local paper. Sent one to Brother Nichols and suggested he print it in the Chronicle. We showed the TV film to about 500 people here in Wichita the other night at a group meeting of all the churches in this area. Believe a great deal of good was done in putting the '55 program over for you. Hope so at least. We at Emporia Avenue will notify you soon as to our plans.

Am sending you under separate cover our new '55 directory. Thought it might interest you due to the addresses of all of the churches in Wichita.

Yours in Christ,

HAROLD E. HERRINGTON
1845 S. Topeka
Wichita 11, Kansas

San Francisco 11, Calif.

November 15, 1954

Brother Willeford
Highland Church of Christ
Abilene, Texas

My dear Brother:

I listen to your program quite often and yesterday, Sunday, Nov. 14th, I heard you re baptism, and I am very interested.

As a babe I was baptized, but have always wondered about it, and I have been very uneasy. I am sure that total baptism like you speak of is the only true way of doing it, and I am going to be fully baptized some day real soon; and would appreciate directions from yourself, as to how, and where, that could be accomplished.

I would like the above mentioned address or radio talk of yesteray, if possible, and also any literature re your works in the direction of my Lord and my God, and my ALL, Jesus Christ. I feel that thru HIM and HIM alone can I reach GOD in Heaven.

I am, and have been very uneasy, and bewildered; re my catholic faith and lately it does not make sense anymore. Please help me if you can, but first is the accurate baptism of myself, or my soul. Thanks, very, very much, for many of your radio addresses. Hope I can meet you someday soon.

Yours sincerely,

T. A. Tomasini
Room 409, 255 California St.,
San Francisco 11, Calif.

SPECIAL MESSAGE TO CONGREGATIONS

Inasmuch as it is necessary that final plans for the number of stations purchased on ABC be furnished four weeks prior to the beginning of the new broadcast year, the Highland elders take this opportunity to make the following request:

All churches that anticipate helping to any degree with this broadcast in 1955 are urged to notify the elders of the Highland Church of Christ, Box 1858, Abilene, Texas, before January 12 if at all possible. This does not mean that a decision later than this date cannot be used, but is suggested in order that the greatest number of stations can be contracted for on the basis of number of commitments.

As we finish this last year of broadcasting, we would once more like to express our sincere thanks and appreciation for the wonderful assistance in every way that has been rendered by sister congregations throughout the United States, Canada, and Alaska, as well as by hosts of individual members of the church. We sincerely hope that the year 1955 will see an even greater work in this field.

WHAT IS THE ONE BAPTISM?

BY JAMES D. WILLEFORD

Radio Sermon No. 149

December 5, 1954

When Paul wrote a letter to the church in Ephesus he said, "There is . . . ONE BAPTISM (Eph. 4:5). What kind of baptism did the apostle have in mind when he penned these words? We must all acknowledge that regardless of what baptism is meant, there is but ONE. It is further agreed that the one baptism must be either water baptism or Holy Spirit baptism; it cannot be both. The apostle says there is ONE.

The Dispensationalists say that the one baptism is not water baptism for such was excluded from Paul's gospel. Their conviction is that Paul preached a different gospel from that which the other apostles first preached. They readily admit that the twelve apostles preached baptism in water, but those who hold the dispensational view feel that Paul labored under a new and different gospel from that which the twelve first preached. A statement of Paul to the Ephesian Christians is thought to sustain this view. The apostle speaks of "the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward" (Eph. 3:2). This Scripture is taken to mean that Paul was given a special work of grace to do which was different from the work of the other apostles. But it is mere assumption to say that the language demands that something was given to Paul that had never before been revealed to anybody else. In writing to the Ephesians Paul speaks of the mystery which was made known to him by revelation, and Dispensationalists assume that this mystery remained hidden until it was revealed to Paul. The language, however, does not demand this; Paul does not say that the mystery had been revealed to him alone. In fact he says the very opposite. In referring to the mystery Paul says, "Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit" (Eph. 3:5). Notice that the mystery was also revealed to other apostles and prophets. A. T. Robertson explains: "He (Paul) had already claimed this revelation for himself (verse 3). Now he claims it for all the other apostles and prophets of God. (A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, IV., p. 530). Paul certainly did not claim an exclusive revelation!

The Dispensational view is that the gospel of grace was never preached till it was revealed to Paul. Mr. Cornelius R. Stam says, "it was through Paul, and no one before Paul, that Christ was 'set forth to be a propitiation THROUGH FAITH IN HIS BLOOD' (Rom. 3:25.)" He says, "Nor had the twelve until then ever proclaimed the gospel of the grace of God. (Cornelius R. Stam, *The Fundamentals of Dispensationalism*. Milwaukee: The Berean Searchlight, 1951, p. 80, and p. 121).

Mr. Stam says further that "When Peter stood up nineteen centuries ago and declared that the last days had come (Acts 2:16,17) he showed that he was totally ignorant of God's plan to usher in a dispensation of grace before the return of Christ" (Ibid, p. 99). But when we read the Bible we learn that Peter preached that men are now redeemed "with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (I Pet. 1:18). If it be said that this was written after Paul received the revelation of the mystery, all that is necessary is to remember that Peter makes no mention of preaching a gospel different from what he once preached. Without doubt he was writing of the same gospel that he had preached since Pentecost, and in I Pet. 5:12, he said he was "testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand." The claim that nobody before Paul ever preached redemption on the merits of Christ's blood is unfounded in fact.

Paul preached the same gospel as that proclaimed by the twelve apostles. After Paul's conversion and the beginning of his ministry, the churches of Judea "heard only, That he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed" (Gal. 1:23). Paul, as all know, had opposed the preaching of the Twelve before his conversion. But after his con-

version he was preaching the same faith (gospel) that he had once sought to destroy so he was preaching the same Gospel that the Twelve had preached before him. This conclusion is irresistible.

It is admitted by everyone that Paul preached water baptism when he started his ministry. After many years of gospel labor, when Paul spoke before Agrippa, he mentioned the fact that he preached the gospel "first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea" (Acts 26:20). In this same speech before the King, Paul said, "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day . . . saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come" (Acts 26:22). Paul had continued preaching the same gospel that he started preaching in Damascus. He had not received any new gospel (different from the one he first preached), when he stood before Agrippa, and this was near the end of his life.

We must conclude therefore that Paul and the other apostles preached baptism in water, and that this is the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5.

Dispensationalists think that the baptism in Paul's epistles is different from that which he taught and practiced in his early ministry. It has to be admitted that Paul did administer water baptism in the early part of his ministry, and this has been one of the main problems for Dispensationalists. But there is no problem at all if one understands that in his epistles he would naturally be speaking of the baptism that he had formerly administered.

But it is insisted that the baptism in Paul's epistles is different, because he never once commands baptism in them, and water is never mentioned as the element. One Dispensationalist has said, "It is also significant that Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles and minister of the body of Christ NEVER ONCE, IN ANY OF HIS LETTERS, COMMANDS OR EVEN EXHORTS US TO BE BAPTIZED WITH WATER" (Cornelius R. Stam, *The Fundamentals of Dispensationalism*, pp. 230, 231).

The circumstances under which Paul's epistles were written account for the fact that he did not command baptism in them. Why should he command baptism in his epistles? They were written to people who had already been baptized, so the natural thing would be for Paul to refer to what baptism does (or had done for them) instead of commanding it. The epistles were not written to us commanding us what to do to become Christians. But from allusions to the way these early people had become Christians, one can learn, even from the epistles, what puts a person into Christ. Peter admittedly preached the gospel containing water baptism. And yet in his two epistles he NEVER ONCE COMMANDS BAPTISM, but he does refer to what baptism does for people. Does this prove that Peter was preaching a different gospel in his epistles from that which he preached in his early ministry? Does it prove that water baptism is not referred to in his letters? If it proves this for Paul, why does it not prove the same for Peter?

The fact that water is not specified as the element by Paul in his epistles becomes circumstantial evidence that he was referring to water baptism. Many of those letters were written to places where Paul had formerly gone administering water baptism. If he was speaking of a different kind of baptism when he wrote back to these people, he should have made it absolutely certain that his readers could not associate his statements with water baptism. Just to speak of baptism would naturally leave the impression that he was talking of the kind he had administered among them. For example, the Ephesian brethren, under Paul's teaching, were baptized in the name of Christ (Acts 19:5). But baptism in the name of Christ is water baptism (Acts 10:47,48). So when Paul later wrote to those brethren and said there is but one baptism, they would naturally associate this with the baptism they had submitted to unless Paul had explained that this was not it.

It is admitted by all that Paul was baptized in water at the time of his own conversion. But in Rom. 6:3,4, one of the very passages that is said to

preclude water baptism, Paul said, "We are buried with him by baptism." The apostle used the first person plural pronoun "we" and thus included himself in speaking of those who had been baptized into Christ. Obviously, He was referring to the time when he had been baptized in water.

I Cor. 1:17 is sometimes used in an effort to prove that water baptism was never a part of Paul's gospel. In this Scripture Paul said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." The argument is made that if I Cor. 1:17 means anything, it means that water baptism was not included in Paul's gospel. It is alleged that since Christ did not send Paul to baptize, but to preach the gospel, it follows that baptism is no part of the gospel. But the statement is about the act of baptizing and the act of preaching, and the only conclusion to be drawn from the premises is that the act of administering baptism is not a part of the act of preaching. Administering baptism was no part of the work that was peculiar to Paul's apostolic functions.

Suppose one should say: "My father sent me not to plow, but to teach farming." Would this mean that plowing is not a part of farming? No! By stating the conclusion in the terms of the verbs in the premise, one is able to see that plowing is not a part of the teaching. But plowing remains a part of the farming that is taught! Likewise, in I Corinthians 1:17, baptizing (administering the act) is no part of the act of preaching that Paul was especially sent to do. But baptism remains a part of the gospel he was to preach! Administering baptism was not peculiar to Paul's apostolic commission. He had the right and authority to baptize on the same basis that others did, but it took a special commission to give him the authority of an apostle. A noted scholar says on this point that, "The duty of the apostles (the chosen men whom the Lord sent), was to go from place to place and spread the gospel as far as possible. Thus the work assigned to them is really preaching and teaching. The work of administering baptism when the preaching and teaching had produced conversion was a matter that any assistant of an apostle could easily attend to for it certainly required no immediate apostolic call" (R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Columbus Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1946, pp. 48, 49).

It is our deep conviction that the ONE BAPTISM is water baptism. In the Great Commission of Matthew 28:19,20, Jesus told the apostles to go and baptize people and He would be with them until the end of the world. Though He would not be with the apostles themselves until the end of the world (because they were to die), He would be with this work they were to begin, and be with all who would perpetuate it until the end of the world. This work included the baptizing, and this baptism was to be administered by men. Holy Spirit baptism was never administered by man, so the baptism of this commission must be water baptism, the kind which man administers. And this was the kind that would continue to the end of the world. So water baptism, since it is to continue to the end of the world, must be the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5; else Paul has two baptisms for this age instead of one.

Dispensationalists think that this is assuming what needs to be proved. They argue that the commission of Matthew 28:19,20, is not the commission for the present age, and that the baptism there is not to continue to the end of the world. The word for world is rendered age; and this baptism, it is claimed, was to last until the end of the age for which that commission was given (but not for the present age). But we are affirming that the gospel for the present age is the gospel of Matthew 28:19,20; that is, the commission of Matthew 28:19,20 is the one under which the work of the present dispensation (calling out a people for the Lord's name) is being done. The tenth and fifteenth chapters of Acts prove that we are now under the commission of Matthew 28:19,20.

In the meeting of the apostles in Jerusalem, James said that "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name" (Acts 15:14). This is admittedly the work of the present dispensation, and it is the very thing that is declared to be the peculiar purpose of Paul's gospel. It was being done, however, by the gospel of Matthew

28. Peter had just said in Acts 15:7 that "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should heard the word of the gospel, and believe." This occurred when Peter preached to Cornelius in Acts 10; it was "at the first", or the first time the gospel was taken to Gentiles. So the gospel by which a people were then being taken out from the Gentiles is the gospel that was preached by Peter to Cornelius. But when Peter preached that gospel to Cornelius he said in Acts 10:37 that it was the gospel "which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached." What was the gospel that "began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached." What was the gospel that "began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached"? It was the gospel of the Great Commission of Matthew 28 which was given in Galilee after John's baptism had ended. Though the preaching of this commission began in Jerusalem on Pentecost, the commission itself was given on a mountain in Galilee; so it could be called the gospel that began from Galilee. Notice, too, that this gospel had already (when Peter preached it to Cornelius) been "published throughout all Judea." It was the gospel that the Twelve had been preaching; it was the gospel of the commission in Matthew 28.

So the gospel that Peter preached to Cornelius is the gospel of Matthew 28:19,20 (that which "began from Galilee"), and it is also the gospel by which a people are being called out from the Gentiles. But the commission in Matthew 28 required baptism that was to continue to the end of the world (or age). But this must be the present age in which a people are being called out from the Gentiles, since this gospel is the one by which the present work is being done. So the baptism of Matthew 28:19,20 is for the present age, and must be the ONE BAPTISM of Ephesians 4:5. Since water baptism is admittedly the baptism of Matthew 28, and the one baptism is the baptism of Matthew 28, the ONE BAPTISM is water baptism.

The ONE BAPTISM is world-wide and age-lasting. It is a burial in water for the remission of past sins. This is not to say that baptism in and of itself removes our sins. The blood of Christ is the procuring element of salvation, and baptism is an appropriating condition of obtaining it. Christ procured (made possible) man's redemption by his death; man, by being baptized in water, appropriates to himself what Christ made possible for him. Baptism is meaningless and ineffectual apart from the cross of Christ. Like faith baptism looks to Calvary. In baptism we trust God's precious promise to save. In baptism, we die "with Christ" (Rom. 6:6-11); we are buried "with Christ" (Rom. 6:4); we are raised "with Christ" (Col. 2:12). Having been "baptized into Christ" (Gal. 3:27), we live "with him" (Rom. 6:8), and as Christians we are trusting the divine promise that "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory" (Col. 3:4).

(The author is indebted to the thesis of Brother Frank Van Dyke for much of the material presented in this sermon. His thesis is filed in the library of Abilene Christian College.)

PROPER SUBJECTS FOR BAPTISM

BY E. R. HARPER

Radio Sermon No. 150

December 12, 1954

No subject of the Bible is more discussed and no subject has more ideas expressed about it than does the simple command of our Lord for us to be baptized. We must remember it was not given by man; it was given by our Lord. When our Lord speaks we must hear; when he commands we must obey. In Matt. 28:18-20 Christ says "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world". Were there no other command for baptism

this one is sufficient to bind it upon the entire human race, as we grow to be accountable unto God.

From this we see the command to be baptized has the authority of heaven and earth behind it. That is all the authority any command can have. How is it therefore, baptism is nonessential but the others are binding? When we refuse baptism we are not rebelling against man, we are rebelling against God. When you begin arguing about baptism just keep this one thing in mind; Christ said "do it." He has ALL POWER.

ONLY ADULTS

The burden of my sermon today shall be to prove to you that ONLY adults, those old enough to understand the teachings of Christ; who believe this teaching; and who repent of their sins, are proper subjects for Bible baptism.

NEW COVENANT

In Jeremiah 31:31-34 the prophet says, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a NEW COVENANT with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." One thing we must see here: the covenant then in force was to cease. A new one is to be made. They are different for Jeremiah says, "Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord. BUT THIS shall be a covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall TEACH NO MORE, every man his neighbor, and every man HIS BROTHER, saying KNOW THE LORD: for they shall ALL know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith the Lord: FOR I will FORGIVE their iniquities and I will remember their SINS NO MORE". In Heb. chapter 8, Paul declares they had then at that time, the New Covenant promise by Jeremiah. He identifies the present covenant with the covenant of Jeremiah, giving the very prophecy in Jer. 31. He declares Christ the mediator of this better covenant based upon better promises (Heb. 8:6). There can be no mistake. We have that covenant now.

CHRIST CONFIRMS IT

In John 6:44-45 Christ corroborates the truth of these statements when he said, "No man can come unto me, except the Father which sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets. And they shall be ALL TAUGHT OF GOD. Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me". This a baby cannot do. Only one accountable, can be taught of God. The prophet said "ALL shall know me". Christ said, "all shall be taught of God".

WHY THE COVENANTS

You may wonder, Why a discussion of the covenants of the Bible? It is THIS: if you do not understand the covenants you may become confused on this subject of baptism, as well as the entire plan of salvation. In this New Covenant, NO BABIES are included. In the Old Covenant of Moses, babies were included. They were circumcised at eight days. In this New Covenant Jeremiah said "ALL shall know God, from the least to the greatest". This a baby can't do. Another thing, in this New Covenant, God promised to "remember their sins no more". Under the Old Covenant an offering was made every year for their sins, Heb. 10:1-4. Hence this New Covenant included only those who had sinned. This eliminates the baby for it has never sinned. Never having sinned, it is not a sinner and therefore needs no covenant between it and God to have its sins "remembered no more". Hence you can see why you must understand the covenants, for the first included babies; the second does not. Unless the second, that of Jeremiah includes babies then you can't

baptize them by the command of Christ for he is the "mediator of this New Covenant"; not the Old.

Having seen that this "New Covenant" of Jeremiah is only for "adults", that, "their sins" might be "remembered no more", I now begin a study of the New Testament to see if its teachings and examples meet with the demands of this New Covenant promised by the prophet Jeremiah. If it is that Covenant promised by Jeremiah it will have to be given to adults only; babies will have to be excluded.

MATTHEW 28:18-20

After Christ arose from the dead he gave this command to his apostle, recorded in Matt. 28:18-20. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost". He limits the baptizing to only those who had been taught. This eliminates babies for you cannot teach them the gospel. After baptism they were to be taught to "observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" saith the Lord. Babies can't "observe all things commanded of God". We are forced to conclude therefore that only adults, not babies, were included in this command of Matt. 28:18-20. This is in perfect harmony with the prophet when he said, under this New Covenant, "All shall know me from the LEAST of them unto the greatest", and with Christ when he said, "They shall ALL be taught of God".

MARK 16:15-16

In Mark 16:15-16 Christ again speaks to his apostles. He says "Go ye into all the world and PREACH THE GOSPEL TO EVERY CREATURE. He that BELIEVETH and IS baptized shall be saved. But he that believeth not shall be damned." Here we find that the man who is taught must also BELIEVE before he is to be baptized. No baby can have the gospel preached to it; no baby can believe this gospel therefore the baby is eliminated again from this account of the Great Commission of our Lord. This explains why you can't baptize an infidel. He is not a believer in the Christ of the gospel and it takes FAITH IN GOD before baptism. Another thing here is, This believer in the gospel, has to be baptized to be saved. The baby is not lost; hence, not a subject of Christ's baptism. Again this is in perfect harmony with Jeremiah and Christ in that, they "must all be taught of God" and coming into this New Covenant. "They all must know the Lord from the least to the greatest". When therefore you attempt to baptize a baby under the Great Commission you violate the New Covenant of God for babies are not included in its demands.

ACTS 2:38

In Acts the second chapter we have what Peter referred to in Acts 11:15 as the BEGINNING. You ask, the BEGINNING OF WHAT? Isa. 2:1-4; Mi. 4:1-2 and Luke 24:46-49 all refer to Jerusalem as the city in which this covenant will begin and Christ said "repentance and remission of sins in his name, shall be preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem". This was to be after his resurrection. Hence in Jerusalem, on Pentecost began this "New Covenant" of Jeremiah. On this occasion Peter, speaking by the Holy Spirit, having told them God had made Jesus whom they had crucified both Lord and Christ, he was asked by them, "What shall we do"? Peter told them to "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS and he shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, or Spirit". Do you think a baby or an infidel would have asked this question? Babies would not have understood this sermon; infidels would have mocked. These were all adults. Peter said to them, "repent and be baptized every one of you—for remission of sins." Think you, Peter would have been telling a group of babies to do this? Those who were baptized on Pentecost, were adults, old enough to understand Peter's sermon; who believed what he had said, and whose faith led them to repent of their sins. Not a baby in this group, and THIS was the BEGINNING of this New Covenant of which Christ is the Mediator. The record says in verse 41 "they that gladly received their

word were baptized." No baby could qualify for such steps as given here by your Bible. Hence, we find that the proper subject for Bible baptism is the one who has been taught of God; who believes what he has been taught; and whose faith has melted his heart to repentance. These conditions of this New Covenant have to be met or he who dares set these aside to baptize a baby or an unbeliever, violates the covenant between God and man. Yes, this also is in perfect harmony with the prophecy of Jeremiah that they "shall know me from the least unto the greatest".

The "design of baptism" eliminates babies from this New Covenant for the design or purpose of baptism, to the penitent believer is, FOR THE REMISSION OF HIS SINS. The baby has no sins to remit and cannot be baptized FOR REMISSION OF SINS nor for any other purpose by the authority of Christ and-or this New Covenant.

ACTS 8:37-38

After the persecution in Jerusalem, Philip went to Samaria and preached Christ unto them, Acts 8:5. Those who "believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, were BAPTIZED, both MEN and WOMEN" (Acts. 8:12). No babies here. All were "men and women." All had to "believe" before baptism. Now the Spirit had Philip to join himself to the chariot in which was riding the Ethiopian eunuch. He had been to Jerusalem to worship and was returning. He was reading Is. chapter 53; That wonderful chapter that foretold of the coming of the Christ; his rejection; and his death. Philip asked the eunuch "understandest thou what thou readest?" The eunuch said, "How can I except some man should guide me". Philip explained the prophecy of Isaiah to him, that it referred to Christ for "he preached unto him Jesus". Having now heard of Jesus, he asks this question, "See here is WATER, what doth HINDER ME to be BAPTIZED?" This question correctly understood would refute for all time to come, the baptizing of babies, infidels, or the mentally unfortunates. There was but one thing that hindered him. It hinders all and forbids the baptizing of babies under this New Covenant. Philip said to him "if thou BELIEVEST WITH ALL THINE HEART THOU MAYEST." No man can be a subject of baptism in the name of Christ who cannot or does not believe. Faith is IMPERATIVE. It is a MUST! What could keep him from being baptized? ONLY UNBELIEF! My good people baptism is an act to which you submit of your free will. It is not an act forced upon you, without your consent or knowledge. Yes, this is again in keeping with the prophecy of Jeremiah, "They all shall know me from the least to the greatest" and they "shall all be taught of God." Upon a confession of his faith in Christ, Philip baptized the eunuch in water and the eunuch went on his way rejoicing. He has now met the conditions of this New Covenant and has the promise that his "sins will be remembered no more against him". Only an adult could have met the requirements given here by Philip to "believe with ALL THINE HEART".

BAPTISM IN THE NAME OF CHRIST

Friends, to baptize in the name of Christ, simply means by his authority. His authority did not begin until after his resurrection (Matt. 28:18; Rom. 1:5). No man could obey the Great Commission of Matt. 28 and Mark 16 before Christ was raised from the dead for they were not given back then. They are a part of this New Covenant and must be obeyed if we are to enjoy the promise of our "sins being remembered no more". Peter in Acts 11:15 referred to Pentecost, in Jerusalem, as the "beginning." Now from Pentecost on we must submit to Christ and this New Covenant. He is the mediator of this New Covenant as Moses was of the Old (Heb. 8:6). He has given us plainly the qualifying conditions for a candidate of baptism in HIS name. He must be one who has been taught of God; who believes what he has been taught; whose faith has led him to repent of his sins, and with faith in Christ, as God's son, the Savior of mankind, he is to be baptized. Since Christ under this New Covenant has never authorized any man to baptize infants or babies, then, to so do is to disobey the Lord. It is adding to his revelation. God says

in Rev. 22:18, "God will add unto him the plagues that are written in this book."

WHY SO INTERESTED IN BABIES

You may ask why so interested in the baptism of babies? It doesn't hurt them! My good people it COULD be the means of causing them to stand before God not having met the conditions of this New Covenant. We can't originate a beautiful ceremony of dedicating our children unto God by baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, unless God, in this New Covenant has authorized it. God has authorized no such practice. When you tell a child or a grown person, You were baptized when a baby, nine times out of ten, THAT person will never obey his Lord in baptism. He will tell you, I have been baptized. They may live and die believing they have obeyed the Lord in this command when they knew nothing about it, to remember, and had nothing to do with it. It was forced upon them and many times against their will. I speak this humbly but SERIOUSLY! Since baptism is a command of God to which you personally are to submit, and that by BELIEVING IN GOD WITH ALL YOUR HEART if it were done for you while a baby, YOU haven't then with your heart, obeyed the Lord in baptism.

Again baptism is "for the remission of sins" to the believer who will repent of his sins. This a baby can't do for it has no sins. Hence, men cannot be baptized by the authority of Christ, until he is able to be taught, to believe in Christ, repent of his sins, and submit to baptism personally for the REMISSION OF SINS. This no baby could do. Now here is our danger; One may go through life thinking he was baptized when a baby and die never having met the conditions of this New Covenant in which our sins are remembered no more" and find himself lost. Who will be to blame if you do? It will not be those of us begging you to meet the requirements of this New Covenant. It will have to be someone who is violating its requirements, telling the world they do not have to submit to the terms of this New Covenant between God and the sinner. Parents therefore thinking they are doing that which will bless their child may be doing the very thing that will cost the soul of that child; for believing it has obeyed its Lord it may die, never having met the conditions of this New Covenant. Friends Why did God give this New Covenant if he did not intend for man to obey it?

HOUSEHOLD BAPTISMS — CORNELIUS

It is said that we have "household baptisms". That they no doubt had babies in them. Cornelius and the Jailer are examples given. In Acts 10:1-4 you will find Cornelius "feared God with all his house" (Acts 10:2). Babies can't fear God. Again those who were baptized at the home of Cornelius could speak. Babies can't speak. You ask, How do I know they could speak? In verse 46 it says "for they heard them speak in tongues and magnify God". Only these were commanded to be baptized (verse 47). Babies can't speak as did these. No babies here.

THE JAILOR

In Acts 16:30-35 we have the account of the Jailer and his conversion. It is argued he may have had babies in his "household". No, for it says Paul "spake the word of the Lord to all who were in his house". You do not preach the word of God to babies. Now after they were all baptized the Bible says he "rejoiced, believing in God with ALL HIS HOUSE". Babies can't believe in God, but ALL HIS HOUSE DID. No, there is no example of a baby ever being baptized by any man of God under this New Covenant, for God did not so order. Friends, every time they were adults. The very thing Jeremiah and Christ said would not be done under this New Covenant, is now being done to these babies AFTER their baptism: They are having to be "taught" to "know their Lord". When babies therefore are baptized the terms of this New Covenant and the command of Christ in John 5:4-5 have been violated and our children may close their eyes in death thinking they have met the

terms of this New Covenant spoken of by Jeremiah. To me this is too serious to just forget an pass by with the shrug of the shoulder.

So I feel we have set forth today in this New Covenant, plainly, the only person who can be baptized in the name of Christ. It is that person who has been taught; who understands what he was taught; who believes in God and Christ with all his heart; and who repenting of sins, is willing to confess his Lord before men. This is not a baby. It is an adult. He then, is baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, FOR the remission of his sins and by so doing enjoys the promises of this New Covenant; His "iniquities are forgiven" and his "sins remembered no more". Will you not do this today that you may enjoy this same blessing? May God bless you and keep you is my prayer in our Master's name.

WHEN SCHOLARSHIP SPEAKS

BY E. R. HARPER

Radio Sermon No. 151

December 19, 1954

Two men, in a hotel, were discussing the Lord's conversation with Nicodemus, in John 3:3-5 where the Lord told him "except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven". One of the men was laboring rather nervously to show that "water" here did not mean "water"; that it meant something else. The other man, rather calmly, just asked his friend this question: If the Lord had meant "water" in John 3:5, what word would he have used to express it if "water" in John 3:5, does NOT mean water? A death-like stillness settled over the conversation and the two men walked away. That word was never found. You may be anxious to know why "water" in John 3:5 is of such vital importance in our discussion of the subject of "Bible Baptism"? It is just this: If "water" in John 3:5 means "water", then baptism is essential to salvation, for here, it is eternally connected with the "new birth". For that reason volumes have been written endeavoring to show that "water" in John 3:5 does not mean "water", hoping by so doing to strike from the plan of salvation the Lord's command to be baptized. Since in baptism, and that alone, we find water connected in any way with the Lord's work then it follows as the "night the day", if "water" in John 3:5 does mean "water" it can only refer to baptism. That would make baptism essential to being "born again". This being true the religious thinking of our time, will have to be revised for much of it has eliminated "water baptism" from the New Birth.

TO THE SCHOLARS

Today I bring to you the scholarship of the religious world concerning many passages of the Bible that men become confused over today. I am happy to say to you that my brethren and I stand eternally upon the truth of the Bible when scholarship speaks. I shall also bring you various translations of the Bible on such passages as Acts 2:38 and John 3:5. But first I shall give to you our Lord, then his inspired apostles as they were directed by the Holy Spirit. Scholarship and all religious teachings must agree with Christ, the Holy Spirit, and His inspired apostles. If not, either the Lord or the scholars one, missed it.

YOUR BIBLE SPEAKS

Matthew 28:18-20

In Matthew 28:19-20 the Lord said, "Go teach all nations baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit". Behind this command is "all the power of heaven and earth" (Matt. 28:18). When "all the power of heaven and earth" commands us to do a thing; that settles it. It must be done or rebell against all heaven. This one passage alone is enough

to bind baptism eternally upon every lost soul. The scholars of the world must agree with this power, else they are wrong.

Mark 16:16

In Mark 16:16 the Lord said "he that believeth and IS baptized shall be saved. But he that believeth not shall be damned". Here the Lord gave the plan by which the lost are saved. He said "he that believeth and IS baptized shall be saved." If you want salvation he has told you how to obtain it. If you want "damnation" he has given us the way to it, "he that believeth not shall be damned." The man therefore who does not believe Mark 16:16 "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" and teaches it another way, becomes the "unbeliever" here and is lost. With the Lord's plan, the scholars must agree or the scholars are wrong. Christ is never wrong for he is the Savior.

Acts 2:38

After Christ had gone back to his Father in Heaven he dispatched the Holy Spirit to guide the apostles into all truth (John 16:13; Acts 2:14). The Spirit speaking through the apostles on that occasion, pricked that audience to their hearts and they asked Peter and the apostles, "men and brethren what shall we do". The Spirit guided Peter to say, "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ FOR the REMISSION OF SINS and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, or Spirit." Now with this the scholarship of the religious world must agree or they are wrong, for Peter did not make a mistake in his answer. Here it was "for the remission of sins."

Acts 22:16

When Paul stood before his accusers the record of which is found in Acts 22 we hear him say, that Ananias, a devout man commanded him to "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins calling on the name of the Lord." In Rom. 6:3-4 Paul explains to us how he was baptized and emphasizes anew the purpose of the act. Paul says "Therefore WE ARE BURIED WITH HIM IN BAPTISM into death" and in verse 3 he says "know ye not that so many of us as were baptized INTO CHRIST were baptized into his death"? Hence this baptism about which I am speaking today is a baptism in water, that you may enter by the New Birth, the kingdom of heaven; that you may be saved from your sins; that you may have the remission of your sins; have your sins washed away; and being "buried with him in this baptism", you are brought "into Jesus Christ", where all Spiritual blessings are to be found and where Paul declares "redemption through his blood even the forgiveness of sins" may be yours to enjoy (Eph. 1:1-7).

WHAT WE HAVE FOUND

This far we have found that this New Birth; the entering into the kingdom of heaven, salvation from sins; remission of sins; the washing away of sins, and the entering into Jesus Christ all came at the completion of our obedience to baptism. In not one of these passages do we find a single one of these blessings enjoyed BEFORE they were "born of water and the Spirit", or as "penitent believers", were "baptized".

DO THE SCHOLARS AGREE

Our question now is, Do the SCHOLARS agree that we are teaching the truth on the place of baptism in the plan of salvation; or are we contradicting them on the above passages. To them we shall now go.

Dr. Albert Barnes, Presbyterian, in his commentary on John 3:5, says, "Be born of water. By WATER here is EVIDENTLY signified baptism". He further says, "It is clear also, that any other command of God might as well be neglected or violated as this."

Dr. Adam Clark, Methodist, in his commentary on John 3:5 says, "Baptism

by water into the Christian faith, was necessary to every Jew and Gentile that entered into the kingdom of the Messiah."

Alvah Hovey, Baptist, and one time President of Newton Theological Institute says of John 3:5, "We may say that being born of water (baptized), must signify being cleansed from sins or forgiven."

Dr. James McKnight, Scotch Presbyterian, and for a time Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, says of John 3:5, "As baptism is the antitype, or thing signified by the deluge a person's coming out of the water of baptism may have been called by our Lord, his being born again of water."

Dr. John Lightfoot, English Presbyterian, and said to be one of the world's greatest Hebrew scholars says of John 3:5, "That by water here is meant baptism, I make no doubt."

John Wesley, founder of the Methodist Church, says of John 3:5, "it means 'baptism'."

Last I give you the testimony of one of the greatest Baptist scholars of his generation, Dr. John R. Graves. In a letter on John 3:5, he says, "If Brother Vaughn convinced us that born of water refers to anything but baptism of one previously born of the Spirit we never knew it and we would have owned it to him and to our readers. It means nothing else and no Baptist that we ever heard or read of ever believed otherwise until A. Campbell frightened them away from an INTERPRETATION that is SUSTAINED by the CONSENSUS of ALL the SCHOLARS of ALL DENOMINATIONS in ALL AGES."

Now here is a man who declares that all scholars throughout all ages have taught "born of water" in John 3:5 could mean nothing else than "baptism". This being true, the thinking of the world must undergo a radical change for this makes "baptism in water" essential to the New Birth. It is good to stand with the Bible and the scholars of all ages. That is where churches of Christ stand today on John 3:5, and have since our beginning in Jerusalem on that Pentecost morning when the Spirit came to guide the apostles into all truth.

ACTS 2:38

One of the most contested passages in all the Bible is that of Acts 2:38. Here Peter, as quoted before says, "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ FOR the remission of sins" etc. It is argued by many that "for" in this passage means "because of" and has a retrospective meaning; that is, it means they were baptized because their sins had already been forgiven and not in order to have their sins forgiven. If it means "because of" it is thought that such an interpretation or translation will eliminate "baptism" from the Lord's plan of salvation as the wrong interpretation or translation of John 3:5 would do.

TRANSLATION

I now give you the various translations of the Bible on Acts 2:38 for you to see that "for" in this passage does not have such a meaning. The King James Translation reads, "Repent and be baptized FOR the remission of sins"; The Revised Version, given up to be the most literal translation yet given, says, "repent and be baptized UNTO the remission of sins." These two translations were given to us by 149 of the greatest religious minds of their day and not one of them translates it "because of". The American Union Translation, in 1865, a Baptist translation of the New Testament says it means, "UNTO the remission of sins." Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed's translation of Acts 2:38 says, "You must repent and every one of you be baptized IN ORDER TO HAVE YOUR SINS FORGIVEN". Dr. Goodspeed was Professor of Biblical and Patristic Greek at the University of Chicago; one of the Baptist's most outstanding scholars. Dr. Charles B. Williams at whose feet I sat in the Union University, Baptist school in Jackson, Tennessee, says in his translation of

Acts 2:38, "Let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, THAT YOU MAY HAVE YOUR SINS FORGIVEN". Joseph B. Rotherham in his translation of 1872, says, "Repent ye and be immersed each one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ INTO THE REMISSION OF YOUR SINS." Dr. Robert Young, author of *Young's Analytical Concordance* and an eminent scholar in the languages, says in his translation, "be baptized each one of you in the name of Jesus Christ TO the remission of sins". My friends, there is no way to misunderstand these translations of Acts 2:38. They just make baptism binding for the remission of sins.

The New Revised Version of our Revised Version, the Bible that has recently been so discussed, translates it as follows, "for the FORGIVENESS OF SINS." Dr. Albert Harkness, Professor of Greek in Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, 1855-1907, one of the organizers of the American School of Classical Studies, in Athens, Greece, translates Acts 2:38 as follows, "Eis in Acts 2:38 denotes purpose and may be rendered IN ORDER TO or FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING". Eis is the Greek word translated "for" in Acts 2:38. Never do these men translate it "because of" or to have a "backward meaning" for the purpose of teaching that the people on Pentecost had already received the remission of their sins and were being baptized because they were already saved, as is being taught today over the world. Acts 2:38 does not so teach. *Young's Analytical Concordance* gives the meaning of "eis" in Acts 2:38 "with a view to". Again looking to the forgiveness of sins.

I now close this part of my lesson on the translations by giving to you one of the greatest Greek scholars of his time. One used by scholars and schools everywhere. He was Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School at Harvard University. Scholarship like this we can't ignore in these vital truths. If "for" in Acts 2:38 does not mean "because of" then we do not better ourselves by holding on to a theory that does not have the backing of the most eminent scholars of the world. Dr. Thayer in his Greek Lexicon, translates "for" in Acts 2:38 as follows, "TO OBTAIN THE FORGIVENESS of sins." To do what? TO OBTAIN THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS. On page 183 of his lexicon, published in 1889 by Harper and Brothers, Dr. Thayer gives the definition to EIS. He says "Eis is a preposition governing the Accusative, and DENOTING ENTRANCE INTO, or DIRECTION and LIMIT: INTO, TO, TOWARDS, FOR, AMONG".

Now he gives page after page illustrating the various shades of meaning as given to this word EIS, from which we get "for" in Acts 2:38. In not one of the passages or illustrations does he EVER give EIS to mean "because of." He was one of the translators of our Revised Version which translates Acts 2:38 "UNTO the remission of sins". Now my good people "for" in Acts 2:38 just does not mean "because of" nor does it "look back" to sins already forgiven. I have given you some 17 translations, including our King James; the Revised Version, with some 165 of the world's greatest scholars, on the meaning of "for" in Acts 2:38 and not one of them translates it to mean "because of". They all with accord, declare baptism to be "for-onto, in order to, with a view to, for the purpose of", and that you, "may obtain" remission of sins. Does it not strike you strangely just here, that not one of them ever translates it to mean that you are "baptized because you are already saved" or "because your sins are already forgiven"?

Yes, the scholarship of the world agrees here with the Lord and his apostles. Churches of Christ have taught this truth since Pentecost. Sinners who have been caused to believe in Christ as their Savior, to repent of their sins, and upon their faith in Christ as the Son of God, have been baptized in the name of Christ, for the remission of their sins; have obeyed the command of the Lord; are Christians; and the Lord has added them to his church. Acts 2:1-47. It is good to know you stand where the Lord, his apostles, the Holy Spirit, and the scholarship of the world stands on these vital truths. I wouldn't

stand anywhere else for the world laid at my feet. My soul is worth too much to make a mistake or hold on to error.

ACTS 22:16

That you may know we do not stand alone with reference to the baptism of Paul and its being essential to his salvation, I now give you some leading men of Acts 22:16 where Ananias says to Saul, "arise and be baptized and WASH AWAY THY SINS". This can mean but one thing and that is the "washing away of his sins" came as a result of his being baptized, as a penitent believer in Christ. Dr. Joseph Beet, Professor of Systematic Theology in the Wesleyan Theological College, Richmond, England, 1885-1905 says of Acts 22:16, "These words evidently mean, Remove the stain of thy sins by the water baptism. Ananias knew that Christ had expressly ordained and commanded the rite; and thus made it a CONDITION of his favour and of the salvation he proclaimed. Therefore, for the repentant persecuter, there was no forgiveness and purification except by formal confession of Christ in baptism."

Dr. Horatio Hackett, who from 1870-1875 was Professor of Biblical Literature and New Testament Exegesis at Newton Theological Institute and one of the greatest scholars of the Baptist faith says of the expression, "And wash away thy sins", "This clause states the result of baptism, in language derived from the nature of that ordinance." Hovey, referred to before, says of Acts 22:16, "It answers to UNTO the forgiveness of sins in Acts 2:38." John Wesley says of this passage, "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins—Baptism administered to real penitents is BOTH a MEANS and a SEAL of PARDON".

OTHERS

Time forbids that I give such men as Armatage, Dill, Foster, Gale, Huntington, McLean, Schaff, and Dr. Willmarth, all of whom corroborate the truth of Acts 2:38 being "in order to—unto—for the purpose of remission of sins". In a later lesson it will be my pleasure to take you back through the ages in a study of this vital subject and let you live, beginning with the close of the first century, with such men as Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Justin Martyr, and hear all, without one exception, declare baptism essential to salvation. Not one taught salvation by "faith only". As Brother Willeford and I close these lessons on the Baptism of the Bible, we are happy that we stand with our Lord, his apostles and the scholarship of the world. We beg you to believe in your Lord and with a penitent heart obey your Lord in baptism for the remission of your sins.

WHY I PREACH THE GOSPEL

BY E. R. HARPER

Radio Sermon No. 152

December 26, 1954

In the long ago, there was a man in Caesarea, whose name was Cornelius. He was a devout man whose prayers God heard. God sent his angel, telling him to send for Peter that he might be told what to do. He obeyed the voice of the angel. Peter came. After introductions were over, Peter asked this question, "For what intent have ye sent for me?" Cornelius told him the story just related and then said to Peter, "Thou hast well done that thou art come, for we are all here present before God to hear ALL THINGS commanded thee of God." Well might we ask today the question, Why has the Highland Church of Christ invited me to preach to you JUST the GOSPEL OF CHRIST? There must be a Scriptural Reason.

MEANING OF GOSPEL

The word "gospel" has become so familiar to us that it has lost much of its real beauty but when understood it becomes the hope of the world. It means "glad news—good tidings—great joy". When we realize man was lost in sin;

that he was without hope in the world to come; with no assurance of a resurrection from the dead, we can begin to understand why the shepherds in their fields that memorable night were made to rejoice when they heard the angel of the Lord say to them, "fear not for behold I bring you GOOD TIDINGS of GREAT JOY, which shall be to all the people for unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord (Luke chapter 2). How the apostles hearts must have leaped for joy years after this when their Savior in John 14 said to them, "You believe in God believe also in me for in my Father's house are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you and if I go to prepare a place for you I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." And finally we see this Savior dying on the cross of Calvary; dying for your sins and mine. To most of the world the promise made by the angel concerning a "Savior's being born"; his "going to prepare a place for them", must have seemed now as empty words and his disciples were laughed to shame. But hope sprang anew when on the third day the stone was rolled away and Christ won for us the victory over death by this glorious resurrection from the dead. Even Peter, long years after Christ had gone back to the Father, was inspired to write these immortal words, that Christ "hath begotten us again unto a lively or (living) hope, by the RESURRECTION of Jesus Christ from the dead".

This my friends is, in a very limited way, what the GOSPEL means to us. This is that "glad news—the good tidings—the great joy" that was to be to all the people. It rejoices our hearts that our sins can be forgiven and by the resurrection we can look away to the over there for the realization of that hope eternal of living with our Savior in a world that shall never end. Why Must I Preach This Gospel? The thing I can't understand is. Why the whole world is not preaching this glorious gospel of Christ!

IS THERE ANOTHER GOSPEL

This brings us to another question, Is there ANOTHER GOSPEL OF SALVATION? Can all our religious teachings be right? Concerning this, Paul says in Gal. 1:6-8, "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto ANOTHER GOSPEL: which is NOT ANOTHER; but there be some that trouble you and would PERVERT the GOSPEL OF CHRIST. But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you let him be ACCURSED." From this there is but one conclusion: There is but ONE gospel of Christ. It is that gospel preached by Paul and the other inspired men of the first century. All others are perversions or substitutes.

DANGERS IN PREACHING ANOTHER

From this it must be plain that the "gospel of Christ" may be PERVERTED and to those who "pervert" the "gospel of Christ" the curses of heaven shall be upon them. You must be CERTAIN, absolutely certain, that which you are preaching and which you have accepted, is the "gospel of Christ", because to "change" the gospel of Christ is to be cursed of heaven. This being true, then no man; no conferences of men; no church or church councils have the right to CHANGE the gospel of Christ without the curses of heaven resting upon them. I therefore MUST BE SURE I am NOT bringing to you a "perverted gospel". You must be just as certain you have not obeyed a "perverted gospel" for by so doing both are lost.

MY REASONS FOR PREACHING THE GOSPEL

Now to our question, Why or My Reasons, For Preaching to You the Gospel of Christ? They are very simple, yet so fundamental. (1) My first reason for preaching to you the gospel of Christ is, My Lord commanded that it be preached. In Mark 16:15 he said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the GOSPEL TO EVERY CREATURE". We go by HIS authority and his alone. No man or set of men has been given the power to decide who shall preach the Gospel of Christ. We are marching under his banner and do not receive licenses from any council or conference of men, to obey this command of our King. You have this gospel, this revelation of God to man (Eph. 3:1-6), It

is your duty to know this gospel that you may teach it to others also (II Tim. 2:1-6; II Tim. 2:15). I am preaching the gospel therefore because it is my duty to obey the commands of my Master and his orders are "preach the gospel to every creature". I must obey his orders!

(2) The Second reason I am preaching the gospel of Christ is, I am "debtor to all men". In Rom. 1:14, Paul declares, "I am DEBTOR both to the Greek and to the Barbarian; both to the wise and the unwise, so as much as IN ME IS. I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are in Rome also." Paul who watched Stephen stoned to death; who bound Christians and put them in prison; who persecuted Christians unto strange cities, and acknowledged himself to have been the "chief of sinners" (Acts 7:58-59; I Tim. 1:15), is now so happy that he has been SNATCHED from the torments of hell; having been freed from all his sins that he feels himself "debtor to all men" and is ready to preach to them this gospel of Christ by which he was made free from all his past sins.

47 YEARS AGO

About 47 years ago there came to our little town a young man preaching the gospel of Christ. My father and mother were not members of the church of Christ. He taught my people the truth and they believed it and were baptized. They became members of the church of Christ and my father preached this glorious gospel for some 35 years. A few years later another came to this same little town of Enola, Arkansas, preaching this same glorious gospel of Christ and baptized me and the girl who is today my wife. This was 40 years ago.

I AM GRATEFUL

For the sacrifices of those men I am humbly grateful. I am so thankful they loved us enough to come our way and tell us how to become Christians, members of the church our blessed Lord built (Matt. 16:18). Because they brought the story of a salvation to me and mine I am, now in my humble way, bringing that same sweet story of a Savior's never dying love, to you, who are so kind to listen to me just now. Though these good men, together with my father and mother, lie sleeping in the bosom of mother earth, I thank God every day that they came our way, many long years ago.

QUESTION FOR YOU

This question I leave with you; How thankful are YOU that someone brought to you and yours this message of hope; this salvation from sin; and pointed you and yours to a better home beyond this vale of tears? What have YOU done to pay your debt? How much of your MONEY are YOU willing to give, now that this gospel of Christ may be told to "every creature in all the world"? Just as Paul became a "debtor," so have you IF you are a Christian. What would America be today without the influence of this gospel of Christ? Others have sacrificed that we might enjoy the blessings of this great country of ours; a land of free men, free to worship God as we please. If these wonderful gifts, bequeathed to us by the sacrifice of our honored dead, continue to be ours that we may hand them down to our sons, YOU who are listening to me today must realize that by YOUR influence and YOUR MONEY the work of preaching the gospel of Christ is to be carried on: That YOU are as much a "debtor" as am I or others; and as was Paul. Yes I am preaching the gospel of Christ BECAUSE I am "debtor" to others, for others brought the gospel to me and mine.

(3) Thirdly, I preach the gospel because it is "God's power unto salvation". Paul in writing to the church at Rome says in Rom. 1:16, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for IT is the POWER of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek". In this verse is contained a truth, if understood, would eliminate much of the confusion in our religious world. In it is plainly stated the power God uses in saving the world; it is the GOSPEL OF CHRIST. This being true where this gospel of Christ has never gone, men are lost. This is why the Highland church of

Christ is working, praying, and pleading for this gospel of Christ to be preached over the radio and TV network to all the world.

This refutes all modern revelations; visions; church traditions; decisions of councils of churches; human creeds; church manuals; or doctrines of men as our modern guides. If the gospel of Christ and that ONLY is the POWER God uses to save the world, as Paul in Rom. 1:16 teaches, then there can be NO SUBSTITUTE. It is a fact, unanswerable, that all these modern revelations, so called; all these so called "infallible dogmas" presented to the world cannot be THIS GOSPEL of Christ given in the first century by Paul, which gospel he declares to be God's power unto salvation, because THESE MODERN THEORIES OF MEN, are CENTURIES TOO LATE. Some one is just wrong! God is not revealing his will to men now as then. If so, they would all agree, now as then. Let some man tell us how we may know his "revelation"; his "infallible dogma" is the right one. Let him tell us how we may know the others are wrong.

Here is where the churches of Christ stand as a separate people in the religious world. We take this gospel of Mark 16:15 and Romans 1:16, this revelation of God as the ONLY RULE of faith and practice; as God's only power unto salvation. When any man or church begins demanding "direct operations of the Spirit"; "baptisms of the Spirit"; new "revelations from heaven"; the "appearance of saints"; to children, for confirmation of truth, or claiming for the church "divine right" to "change God's word" to suit a "modern age", you may set this down as a truth UNANSWERABLE; no two of them will agree; all will sooner or later contradict the gospel of Christ, our "New Testament", the Bible; all will contradict themselves if allowed to go long enough, and by such claims and practices the world will be kept in religious confusion and infidelity will run rampant and sin will continue to rule the world. Christ prayed for UNITY (John chapter 17); not for confusion. There is but one hope for unity as prayed for by our Lord, and that is to reject all revelations, church traditions, decrees of human councils; surrender all doctrines and practices of men, that are not found in THIS admitted revelation of God, the "gospel of Christ". The gospel preached by Paul made men and churches what God wanted them to be (Acts 2:1-47; II Tim. 2:15-17; and II Tim. 4:1-4). It will make you the same today. Any other gospel than the one preached then, Paul declares to be a "perverted gospel", with the curses of heaven" resting upon all who preach another gospel; a "perverted gospel".

Yes I preach the "gospel of Christ" and that ONLY, for IT, not the dogmas of men; not the so called infallible decrees of councils; but the "gospel of Christ" is "the power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1:16). When man stands as do we, upon this gospel of Christ and it only, without addition or subtraction, no man can long stand before such faith and defend his claims to "modern revelations"; nor can he long stand before us defending "idolatrous practices, bowing before images", or his "infallible claims" which claims also contradict themselves AND the gospel of Christ. A stand like this cannot be overthrown for God's word is eternal and unanswerable. Yes, I preach the "gospel of Christ" and it alone because it is "The power of God unto salvation to EVERY ONE THAT BELIEVETH to the Jew first and also unto the Greek."

(4) My fourth reason for preaching the "gospel of Christ" and that only, is, Paul says in II Thess. 1:7-9, "to you who are troubled rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking VENGEANCE on them that know not God, AND who OBEY NOT THE GOSPEL of our LORD JESUS CHRIST".

You will remember in the beginning of this lesson I read to you from the gospel recorded by Mark in chapter 16 where Christ said, "go ye into all the world and preach the GOSPEL to EVERY CREATURE"? Always there is a reason why Christ gives a command. We can now see why he wants his gospel preached and not "modern revelations", "modern visions", "modern church traditions". 1. First, Paul declares this gospel to be God's POWER unto

salvation to EVERY ONE WHO BELIEVES IT. Without it man is lost. There is no answer TO this. There is no OTHER POWER to bring man to Christ. We have to preach THIS gospel of Christ. 2. The second reason, we find why Christ commands this gospel to be preached is, Paul declares in II Thess., chapter one, that the world is to be "banished from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power" if they do not "OBEY THE GOSPEL OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST." This being true can't you see, if you have not obeyed THIS GOSPEL of Christ, as preached by these men in the first century, that you are to be lost? How I wish I could so stir your hearts that you would not rest until you are assured you have obeyed THIS GOSPEL of Christ and NOT a "perverted gospel"; not some "modern dogma", given to you by some so called infallible church council, two thousand years this side God's revelation to man. You just can't afford to obey something that is NOT this GOSPEL preached by Paul and the inspired men of the first century. Paul declares you shall be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power", if you obey not the "gospel of Christ" (II Thess. 1:8-9). As you die you shall meet your Lord. I plead with you therefore to obey the gospel of Christ that you may be saved. Yes, "I preach the gospel of Christ", because men shall be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord", if they do not obey it. (II Thess. 1:7-9).

(5) Last, I preach the gospel of Christ, and it only, because in it and in it alone, is found the way of salvation (II Tim. 3:15-17), and by it man is to be judged (Rom. 2:16). Are you willing to obey what it says that you may be saved and a member of the church the Lord built (Matt. 16:18)? If so I can tell you now what to do.

In Mark 16:16, the Lord said, "he that believeth and IS baptized shall be saved. But he that believeth not shall be damned". This can't be misunderstood. Peter on Pentecost, when asked what to do, replied, "repent AND be BAPTIZED, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost". Verse 41 says, "Then they that gladly received their word were baptized and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls". Now verse 47 says, "and the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved". To what church did he add them? Just one at that time. It was HIS (Matt. 16:18). We can't misunderstand what Christ told men to do to be saved, "believe and be baptized (Mark 16:16); neither can we misunderstand what Peter told them. He said, "repent and be baptized EVERY ONE OF YOU—for the remission of sins". We may let ourselves become confused because the church to which we belong does not teach it this way, but to misunderstand what these did in Acts chapter two, is a mental impossibility. From the Lord's own command and that of his apostles in Acts 2:38 it is; believe in your Lord, repent of your sins, and with faith in Christ as God's Son, you are to be baptized in his name FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS—that you may be saved. It is this, OR deny and reject your Bible and, set aside your Lord's own words in Mark 16:16 and this revelation of his will to his apostles in Acts 2:38-47.

My good friends there is no way around this. Those who did what the Lord commanded in Mark 16:16; those who obeyed the orders of Peter and the apostles on Pentecost (Acts 2) were saved, and enjoyed Remission of sins, and the Lord added them to His church (Acts 2:47). If you will do the same thing it will make you what it made them. If you refuse, can't you see you will be denied the blessings given them?

Now the churches of Christ believe and teach this same gospel. It was THIS gospel of Christ that Paul declared to be "God's power unto salvation"; that all who did not "obey it" would be lost; and "by which" we shall be "judged" (Rom. 2:16). This gospel commands you to "believe in God" (Heb. 11:6); to repent of your sins (Acts 17:30); "to confess your Lord before men" (Matt. 10:32); and to be "baptized in his name for the REMISSION OF SINS". And finally it teaches you to "be faithful unto death and I will give you a crown of life" (Rev. 2:10). We can't misunderstand this! You may not believe it! You may let someone confuse you and cause you not to do it but to misunder-

stand Christ and his apostles in these simple commands I have given you today cannot be done!

It is now up to you to obey your blessed Lord and lead your children to do what is right. I have done all I can. You must act. Will you not, TODAY, obey your Lord and be saved? Yes, I MUST PREACH THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST AND THAT ONLY, because the gospel of Christ is GOD'S POWER UNTO SALVATION AND MAN IS LOST IF HE DOES NOT OBEY IT. May God bless you and keep you, is my prayer in Christ's holy name.

GUEST SPEAKERS

In keeping with our promise some time back we are now publishing the list of guest speakers who have accepted the invitation to speak on the Herald of Truth broadcast during 1955.

George Bailey, Abilene, Texas; A. R. Holton, Washington, D. C.; Willard Collins, vice-president David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee; I. A. Douthitt, Chattanooga, Tennessee; L. D. Webb, Portland, Oregon; J. E. Wainwright, El Segundo, California; James D. Groves, Detroit, Michigan; Harry E. Payne, Florida Christian College, Tampa, Florida; W. B. West, Jr., head, Bible department, Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas; Guy N. Woods, Memphis, Tennessee; N. B. Hardeman, Henderson, Tennessee; George H. Stephenson, Memphis, Tennessee; Don Gardner, Jackson, Tennessee; Don Morris, president, Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas; Charles Chumley, Nashville, Tennessee; James W. Nichols, editor, Christian Chronicle, Abilene, Texas.

As soon as definite dates are assigned, notice will be duly given. We would appreciate any announcements from booklets or in church bulletins.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

November, 1954

RECEIPTS:

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Paid on Pledges | \$26,032.16 | |
| Contributions | 6,955.59 | |
| Transcriptions | 450.00 | |
| Miscellaneous | 37.12 | |
| Total receipts for November, '54..... | | \$33,474.87 |

EXPENDITURES:

Broadcasting Expense:

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Tape Recording | 856.58 | |
| Radio Time | 20,345.97 | |
| Television | 137.31 | |
| | | 21,339.86 |

| | | |
|--------------|-------|--|
| Travel | 38.64 | |
|--------------|-------|--|

| | | |
|-------------|----------|--|
| Wages | 2,435.76 | |
|-------------|----------|--|

Office Expense:

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------|
| Insurance | 174.65 | |
| Postage | 227.50 | |
| Social Security Expense | 36.72 | |
| Office Supplies | 17.29 | |
| Printing | 366.82 | |
| Utilities | 10.90 | |
| Tel. & Tel. | 74.94 | |
| Rent | 150.00 | |
| Miscellaneous | 50.00 | |
| | | 1,108.82 |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------|
| Total expenditures for November, '54 | | \$24,923.08 |
|--|--|-------------|

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------|
| Receipts exceed expenditures by | | \$ 8,551.79 |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------|

HIGHLAND CHURCH OF CHRIST
RADIO PROGRAM
Fifth and Highland
P. O. Box 1858
ABILENE, TEXAS

Sec. 34.66 P.L.&R.

POSTMASTER:
FORM 3547 REQUESTED

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED